

1 **LAW OFFICE OF MARTIN STANLEY**  
2 Martin Louis Stanley [State Bar No. 102413]  
3 100 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 700  
4 Santa Monica, CA 90401  
5 Telephone: (310) 399-2555

6 **BARRETT LAW OFFICE**  
7 Edmont T Barrett [State Bar No. 74117]  
8 P.O. Box 607  
9 Diamond Springs, CA 95619  
10 Telephone: (530) 642-8468

11 Attorneys for *Plaintiff*, MARCO MILLA

12 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

13 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

14 MARCO MILLA an individual,

15 Plaintiff,

16 vs.

17 CITY OF LOS ANGELES a municipal  
18 entity; LOS ANGELES POLICE  
19 DEPARTMENT, a municipal entity;  
20 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,  
21 DETECTIVE R. ULLEY AND  
22 DETECTIVE J. VANDER HORCK, and  
DOES 1 through 100, inclusive,

23 Defendants.

24 Case No. CV-00134-FWS-MRW  
25 Hon. Judge Fred W. Slaughter

26 **PLAINTIFF MARCO MILLA'S  
MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 5 TO  
PRECLUDE DEFENSE FROM  
ATTEMPTING TO MAKE ANY  
WRONGFUL CLAIM AND/OR  
INSINUATION THAT PLAINTIFFS'  
COUNSEL SOMEHOW AFFECTED  
THE SWORN DEPOSITION  
TESTIMONY OF RAMAR JENKINS;  
DECLARATION**

27 **Trial**

28 Date: 05/16/2023

Time: 08:30 AM

Courtroom: 10D, Santa Ana

**Pre-Trial Conference**

Date: 05/05/2023

Time: 09:00 AM

Courtroom: 10D, Santa Ana

**TO: ALL INTERESTED PARTIES:**

**PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that plaintiff hereby moves in limine to preclude any attempt by defense counsel to wrongfully imply or otherwise suggest that plaintiffs' counsel somehow influenced Ramar Jenkins testimony during his deposition simply because they both visited him for a brief period of time over a week before the deposition in prison to ask if he would agree to be deposed.

This motion is based on the attached declaration which demonstrates there is absolutely no evidence demonstrating any wrongdoing on plaintiffs' counsel's part and that any attempt to claim such is irrelevant, highly prejudicial and simply wrong. The motion is based on FRE 402 and 403 as well as case law cited in the points and authorities below.

DATED: April 13, 2023

Respectfully submitted,  
LAW OFFICES OF MARTIN STANLEY

By: /s/ Martin Stanley  
MARTIN STANLEY, ESQ.  
Attorneys for Plaintiff MARCO MILLA

# MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

## I. STATEMENT OF FACTS

Both plaintiff's counsel and plaintiff are objecting to the defense counsel's attempt to insinuate or claim that plaintiffs' counsel somehow, by simply visiting Ramar Jenkins in prison to interview him and see if would agree to be deposed, affected his testimony.

Plaintiff's counsel, Barrett and Stanley, went to the trouble of locating and arranging to interview Jenkins at a remote prison in the desert in order to investigate what happened during the time that the investigating police detectives interviewed him concerning his positive identification of plaintiff in a photo six-pack on October 22, 2001. The reason they wanted to interview Mr. Jenkins was twofold:

1. First, Ramar Jenkins had been interviewed previously, on October 11, 2001 and, even though he was shown a photo array which included a picture of Mr. Milla, he was unable to identify Mr. Milla.
2. Second, counsel were curious about why there were two recordings of the October 22, 2001 interview. That is, the police first interviewed Mr. Jenkins and recorded it, but then interviewed and recorded Mr. Jenkins a second time. The interviewing detectives said in their report that the first recording did not record properly and it was impossible to understand what was said on the recording. Therefore, the interviewing detectives recorded a second interview in which the alleged “positive identification” was made in response to leading questions.

1 Therefore, Mr. Barrett and Mr. Stanley were curious to learn whether Mr. Jenkins  
2 could explain these discrepancies. When they heard Mr. Jenkins' answers, they asked if  
3 he would agree to be deposed in this case.  
4

5 Defense counsel has implied that Messrs. Stanley and Barrett somehow  
6 inappropriately influenced his testimony, without any factual basis whatsoever.  
7 Moreover, Defense Counsel has implied that Messrs. Stanley and Barrett successfully got  
8 Jenkins to lie in only about 20 minutes; the time being verifiable by checking the records  
9 of the Litigation Office at Calipatria. And that they did this without any promises,  
10 inducements or enticements, and despite the fact that Jenkins was himself shot by the  
11 shooter, not to mention that one of his best friends was killed by the shooter.  
12

13 As stated above, the truth is that counsel went to interview Jenkins because of the  
14 suspicious nature of his original identification of Milla. Remember, the first time Jenkins  
15 was shown a photo array with Milla's picture, Jenkins did not ID Milla. The second time  
16 he was shown a photo array (documented at pg. 8 of the 9-page report attached above, the  
17 cops wrote:  
18

19 "Jenkins' show-up was recorded on Tape # 249678. However, detectives  
20 played the tape prior to leaving Jenkins' home and realized the tape had recorded  
21 poorly. Detectives then used a microcassette Tape # 217290 to re-record the  
22 identification made by Jenkins.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 Detectives will have SID attempt to enhance the sound quality of Tape #  
2 249678."

3 The original tape was never transcribed and no audible copy was ever produced by  
4 anyone. In fact, the nature of ID at the second interview is so suspicious, that in the oral  
5 arguments of both appeals, the 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit panel each time brought out that one of the  
6 issues in this case was the interview technique utilized in that interview with Mr. Jenkins.  
7

8 A review of the Jenkins deposition testimony demonstrates that counsel was the  
9 one who brought up that they briefly met with him prior some time before the deposition  
10 and he thereafter testified over and over in response to defense counsel's angry  
11 questioning toward him that counsel had nothing to do with what he stated. There is no  
12 evidence to the contrary.  
13

14 Of course, defense counsel would like this Court to ignore Jenkins clear and  
15 unequivocal testimony regarding the substantial pressure the defendants placed on him  
16 way back when he was 17 years old after having been shot, even after having been  
17 hounded by defense counsel's aggressive questioning which was evident in person and  
18 will likely be evident on the video. Defense counsel would like this Court to ignore that  
19 Jenkins testified that he was happy to finally be able to clear his conscience 20 years later  
20 after the police officers had told him way back then that this Mexican gang had been  
21 killing young black kids in the area right before they pointed their finger specifically at  
22 Milla's photo over and over again saying look at the scar before Jenkins agreed that was  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 him. And defense counsel would like this Court to ignore that the officers somehow  
2 “lost” the tape of the interview and in the re-tape after the questioning was wholly  
3 leading.  
4

5 Contrary to what defense counsel states without a shred of evidence submitted  
6 therewith, Ramar Jenkins’ deposition was taken after (a) obtaining available dates from  
7 defense counsel (see attached as Exhibit 1 a true and correct copy of emails documenting  
8 the available dates for defense), (b) moving ex parte to the Magistrate to issue an order,  
9 which order was issued with no objection whatsoever being filed by defense (See, Docket  
10 Document entry 230.  
11

12 Plaintiff met and conferred after the deposition with defense counsel, who  
13 indicated at the end of the deposition transcript (perhaps because the testimony did not go  
14 his client’s way) that he was going to object to the playing and/or reading of the  
15 deposition transcript. This was the first time he had actually objected to the proceedings  
16 going forward. Mr. Plowden, defense counsel at the time, was fully able to participate in  
17 the deposition and asked all the questions he wanted to ask.  
18

19 The bottom line is there is no good reason or evidentiary basis or any reason  
20 whatsoever for defense counsel to attempt to allege any wrongdoing on the part of  
21 plaintiffs’ attorneys, except to try to wrongfully and in bad faith influence this Court  
22 and/or a jury.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1           Further, police officers from LAPD had previously visited Mr. Jenkins, according  
2 to his deposition testimony. Does that mean they improperly attempted to influence his  
3 testimony?  
4

5           **II. ANY ATTEMPT TO FALSELY IMPLY ANY WRONGDOING ON**  
6           **COUNSEL'S PART IS IRRELEVANT, SPECULATIVE AND HIGHLY**  
7           **PREJUDICIAL**

8           FRE 402 and 403 provide that this Court may exclude irrelevant matters as well as  
9 matters whose “probative value is substantially outweighed” by the danger of undue  
10 prejudice, confusing the issues, misleading the jury, or an undue consumption of time.  
11 [FRE 403].  
12

13           The evidence in this case demonstrates strongly that there is no wrongdoing on  
14 counsel's part and that defendants have absolutely no evidence of any wrongdoing on  
15 counsel's part.  
16

17           As such, this motion in limine should be granted.  
18

19           DATED: April 13, 2023  
20

21           Respectfully submitted,  
22           LAW OFFICES OF MARTIN STANLEY  
23

24           By: \_\_\_\_\_/s/ Martin Stanley \_\_\_\_\_  
25           MARTIN STANLEY, ESQ.  
26           Attorneys for Plaintiff MARCO MILLA  
27

## DECLARATION OF MARTIN STANLEY

I, MARTIN STANLEY, declare:

1. I am an attorney duly licensed to practice law in this Court, attorney of record for Plaintiff MARCO MILLA. The facts herein are of my own personal knowledge, and if sworn I could and would competently testify thereto.
2. Both plaintiff's counsel and plaintiff are objecting to the defense counsel's attempt to insinuate or claim that plaintiffs' counsel somehow, by simply visiting Ramar Jenkins in prison to interview him and see if would agree to be deposed, affected his testimony. Because of this extremely inappropriate accusation, I feel compelled to set forth my dozens of years of service to the State Bar and other community service organizations. As set forth in the emails between counsel attached as an exhibit to our application, among other things, I was previously a probation monitor for the State Bar, appointed to the State of California Diversion Committee of the State's Dental Board, previously called on by the California Committee on Judicial Performance to aid in an intervention on a sitting judge, have voluntarily taught dozens if not hundreds of Mandatory Continuing Legal Education seminars in the area of ethics, substance abuse in the legal profession and malpractice and have been nominated by my peers 3 times in the past 15 years by the Consumer Attorneys Association of Los Angeles for trial lawyer of the year.

1 Mr. Barrett has been a long time criminal law practitioner with an impeccable  
2 reputation.

3 3. Mr. Barrett and I went to the trouble of locating and arranging to interview Jenkins  
4 at a remote prison in the desert in order to investigate what happened during the  
5 time that the investigating police detectives interviewed him concerning his  
6 positive identification of plaintiff in a photo six-pack on October 22, 2001. The  
7 reason we wanted to interview Mr. Jenkins was twofold:  
8

9 4. First, Ramar Jenkins had been interviewed previously, on October 11, 2001 and,  
10 even though he was shown a photo array which included a picture of Mr. Milla, he  
11 was unable to identify Mr. Milla.  
12

13 5. Second, we were curious about why there were two recordings of the October 22,  
14 2001 interview. That is, the police first interviewed Mr. Jenkins and recorded it,  
15 but then interviewed and recorded Mr. Jenkins a second time. The interviewing  
16 detectives said in their report that the first recording didn't record properly and it  
17 was impossible to understand what was said on the recording. Therefore, the  
18 interviewing detectives recorded a second interview in which the "positive  
19 identification" was made in response to leading questions.  
20

21 6. Therefore, Mr. Barrett and I were curious to learn whether Mr. Jenkins could  
22 explain these discrepancies. When we heard Mr. Jenkins' answers, we asked if he  
23 would agree to be deposed in this case.  
24

25

26

27

28

1     7. The defense counsel is implying that we somehow inappropriately influenced his  
2     testimony, without any factual basis whatsoever. Moreover, he is implying that we  
3     successfully got Jenkins to lie in only about 20 minutes; the time being verifiable  
4     by checking the records of the Litigation Office at Calipatria. And we did this  
5     without any promises, inducements or enticements. He is implying we were also  
6     able to do this despite the fact that Jenkins was himself shot by the shooter, not to  
7     mention that one of his best friends was killed by the shooter.

8     8. As stated above, the truth is that we went to interview Jenkins because of the  
9     suspicious nature of his original identification of Milla. Remember, the first time  
10    Jenkins was shown a photo array with Milla's picture, Jenkins did not ID Milla.  
11    The second time he was shown a photo array (documented at pg. 8 of the 9-page  
12    report attached above, the cops wrote:

13                    “Jenkins' show-up was recorded on Tape # 249678. However,  
14                    detectives played the tape prior to leaving Jenkins' home and realized the  
15                    tape had recorded poorly. Detectives then used a microcassette Tape #  
16                    217290 to re-record the identification made by Jenkins.

17                    Detectives will have SID attempt to enhance the sound quality of  
18                    Tape # 249678.”

19     9. The original tape was never transcribed and no audible copy was ever produced by  
20     anyone. In fact, the nature of ID at the second interview is so suspicious, that in the  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 oral arguments of both appeals, the 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit panel each time brought out that one  
2 of the issues in this case was the interview technique utilized in that interview with  
3 Mr. Jenkins.  
4

5 10. A review of the draft of Jenkins deposition testimony demonstrates that I was the  
6 one who brought up that we briefly met with him prior some time before the  
7 deposition and he thereafter testified over and over in response to defense  
8 counsel's angry questioning toward him that we had nothing to do with what he  
9 stated. There is no evidence to the contrary.  
10  
11

12 11. Of course, defense counsel would like this Court to ignore Jenkins clear and  
13 unequivocal testimony regarding the substantial pressure defendants placed on him  
14 way back when he was 17 years old after having been shot, even after having been  
15 hounded by defense counsel's aggressive questioning which was evident in person  
16 and will likely be evident on the video. Defense counsel would like this Court to  
17 ignore that Jenkins testified that he was happy to finally be able to clear his  
18 conscience 20 years later after the police officers had told him way back then that  
19 this Mexican gang had been killing young black kids in the area right before they  
20 pointed their finger specifically at Milla's photo over and over again saying look at  
21 the scar before Jenkins agreed that was him. And defense counsel would like this  
22 Court to ignore that the officers somehow "lost" the tape of the interview and in  
23 the re-tape after the questioning was wholly leading.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

12. Contrary to what defense counsel states without a shred of evidence submitted  
1 therewith, Ramar Jenkins' deposition was taken after (a) obtaining available dates  
2 from defense counsel (see attached as Exhibit 1 a true and correct copy of emails  
3 documenting the available dates for defense), (b) moving ex parte to the Magistrate  
4 to issue an order, which order was issued with no objection whatsoever being filed  
5 by defense (See, Docket Document entry 230).

6  
7  
8  
9 13. Plaintiff met and conferred after the deposition with defense counsel, who  
10 indicated at the end of the deposition transcript (perhaps because the testimony did  
11 not go his client's way) that he was going to object to the playing and/or reading of  
12 the deposition transcript. This was the first time he had actually objected to the  
13 proceedings going forward.

14  
15 14. Mr. Plowden, defense counsel, was fully able to participate in the deposition and  
16 asked all the questions he wanted to ask, as demonstrated in the rough draft  
17 submitted to this Court (the court reporter did err in the rough draft that it was Mr.  
18 Barrett my co-counsel asking the questions when it was in fact me and she is  
19 making that correction).

20  
21 15. The bottom line is there is no good reason or evidentiary basis or any reason  
22 whatsoever for defense counsel to attempt to allege any wrongdoing on the part of  
23 plaintiffs' attorneys, except to try to wrongfully and in bad faith influence this  
24 Court and/or a jury.

25  
26  
27  
28

1 16. Further, police officers from LAPD had previously visited Mr. Jenkins, according  
2 to his deposition testimony. Does that mean they improperly attempted to influence  
3 his testimony?  
4

5 17. Finally, counsel have thoroughly met and conferred on this issue. Besides  
6 discussing this issue with defense counsel, among other things, on April 11, 2023,  
7 2 days prior to filing, plaintiff's counsel emailed this motion in limine to defense  
8 counsel asking that he review it and respond as to whether he would agree to it or  
9 not.  
10

12

13 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the  
14 foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on April 13, 2023, at  
15 Santa Monica, California.  
16

17 By: \_\_\_\_\_/s/ MARTIN STANLEY \_\_\_\_\_  
18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

# **EXHIBIT 1**



Martin Stanley <mstanleyesq@gmail.com>

## Milla Final Pretrial Conference 2:16-cv-00134

**Martin Stanley** <mstanleyesq@gmail.com>  
To: Geoff Plowden <geoffrey.plowden@lacity.org>  
Cc: Paul Cruz <paul\_cruz@cacd.uscourts.gov>

Wed, Mar 30, 2022 at 10:24 AM

Hi. Hope all is well. We are trying to proceed with the depo of ramar jenkins on April 6 at 1 PM which is an agreed date for both parties. He is in state prison. The prison has set it all up for us on short notice and we are hoping the court would grant an order to take the depo quickly since he is a prisoner under rule 30 of frcp. The case had been assigned to magistrate judge wistrich for discovery issues but since he is no longer there who do we submit the application to and do you believe we can get it signed quickly or should we change the depo date? Thanks so much.  
Martin stanley  
Attorney for plaintiff

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 15, 2022, at 7:36 PM, Geoff Plowden <geoffrey.plowden@lacity.org> wrote:

## Milla depo Jenkins

Inbox x



**Martin Stanley** <mstanleyesq@gmail.com>

Thu, Mar 31, 2022, 10:43 AM

to Geoff

Just wondering if u have any objection to moving it to noon if prison can do that? Thx

Sent from my iPhone



**Martin Stanley** <mstanleyesq@gmail.com>

Thu, Mar 31, 2022, 9:53 PM

to Geoff

just checking again to see if you have any objection to moving depo to noon if the prison is ok with that? appre  
reply one way or the other. thx.



**Geoff Plowden** <geoffrev.plowden@lacity.ora>

Fri, Apr 1, 2022, 9:15 AM

## Milla

Inbox 

M

**Martin Stanley** <mstanleyesq@gmail.com>

Mon, Mar 28, 2022, 5:52 PM

to Geoff

We are on for April 6 at 1 PM and And I notice under federal rules we need an order to depose a prisoner which court should basically automatically grant. Are you willing to stip so I can send to the magistrate ? Thx for reply

Sent from my iPhone

G

**Geoff Plowden**

Mon, Mar 28, 2022, 5:54 PM

I need to see a notice of depo. Then I will review the stip. -- Geoffrey Plowden Deputy City Attorney Police Litig

M

**Martin Stanley** <mstanleyesq@gmail.com>

Mon, Mar 28, 2022, 6:14 PM

to Geoff

here is the draft of the stip and a draft of the notice. let me know whether you agree or need any changes or modifications. thanks. martin

## **PROOF OF SERVICE**

**STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is 100 Wilshire Blvd, Suite 700, Santa Monica, California 90401.

**On April 13, 2023**, I served the foregoing document(s) on the interested parties in this action by email as follows:

### **Attorney for Defendants:**

---

## KEVIN GILBERT

Email: [kgilbert@ohhlegal.com](mailto:kgilbert@ohhlegal.com)

BY ELECTRONIC DELIVERY DUE TO COVID-19

STATE: I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct.

Executed on April 13, 2023, at Santa Monica, California

/s/ MARTIN STANLEY

Martin Stanley